

REMARKS

Forty-Six claims were originally filed in this case, and claims 1-31 and 44-46 are allowed. Claims 36 and 39-43 were objected to, and claims 32-35, 37 and 38 were rejected. Claims 32, 33, 37 and 38 have been canceled. Claims 34-36, 39 and 41 have been amended. Reconsideration of the application in view of the above changes and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Drawings

In paragraph 1 of the Detailed Office Action, the Examiner noted that the drawings were considered informal, and that formal drawings will be required once the case is allowed. Applicant requests that this requirement be held in abeyance until the notice of allowance and request for issue fee are required.

Claim Objections

In paragraph 2 of the Detailed Office Action, the Examiner noted that claims 36 and 39-43 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicant has amended claim 36 into independent form including the limitations of the base claim (claim 32) and any intervening dependent claims (claim 33). Thus, claim 36 is now believed to be in condition for allowance. Claims 41-43 have been amended to depend directly

or indirectly from claim 36, and therefore, as amended, are also believed to be in a condition for allowance.

Applicant has amended claim 39 into independent form including the limitations of the base claim (claim 32) and any intervening dependent claims (claim 37 and 38). Thus, claim 39 is now believed to be in condition for allowance. Claim 40 continues to depend directly from claim 39, and therefore, is also believed to be in a condition for allowance. Claims 34 and 35 have been amended to depend directly from claim 39, and therefore, are also believed to be in a condition for allowance.

Based on the above amendments to claims 36 and 39, claims 34-36 and 39-43 are now believed to be allowable. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request allowance of claims 1-31, 34-36 and 39-46.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

In paragraph 2 of the Detailed Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 32-35 and 37-38 under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Henninger et al. (US Patent No. 5,499,371). Applicant's counsel has confirmed in a telephone conversation with the Examiner that the remarks in paragraph 5 of the Detailed Office Action relate to claim 32, that the reference to claim 1 is a typographical error. Claims 32, 33, 37 and 38 have been canceled.

In view of the foregoing amendments, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims now presently in this case are now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and prompt favorable action are therefore solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

DAMODAR DAS PERIWAL

By:



Greg T. Sueoka, Esq.
Registration No. 33,800
Fenwick & West LLP
Two Palo Alto Square
Palo Alto, CA 94306
(650) 858-7194 (Phone)
(650) 494-1417 (Fax)

20748/02962/DOCS/973036.1